arXiv:hep-th/9602073v2 1 May 1996

KEK-TH-470
KEK Preprint 95-207
H
February 1, 2008

One-Instanton Calculations in $N = 2$ Supersymmetric $SU(N_c)$ Yang-Mills Theory

Katsushi Ito[⋆]

Institute of Physics, University of Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305, Japan

and

Naoki Sasakura[⋆⋆]

Theory Group, KEK, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305, Japan

and

Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Sendai 980-77, Japan

ABSTRACT

We calculate the one-instanton contribution to the prepotential in $N = 2$ supersymmetric $SU(N_c)$ Yang-Mills theory from the microscopic viewpoint. We find that the holomorphy argument simplifies the group integrations of the instanton configurations. For $N_c = 3$, the result agrees with the exact solution.

[⋆] E-mail address: ito@het.ph.tsukuba.ac.jp
[⋆⋆] E-mail address: sasakura@tuhep.phys.tohoku.ac.jp

Following the works by Seiberg and Witten[1], the quantum moduli space of the $N=2$ supersymmetric QCD in the Coulomb branch has been studied extensively [2- 5]. The holomorphy and duality in the low energy effective theory determine the prepotential exactly, which includes the non-perturbative instanton effects. From the microscopic viewpoint, this exact result provides a non-trivial and quantitative test to the method of instanton calculations [6,7,8].

The perturbative non-renormalization theorem[9] shows that in the $N=2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory the first non-trivial correction to the prepotential beyond the one-loop effect is the one-instanton contribution[10]. Finnell and Pouliot [11] compute the four-fermi interaction in $N=2$ $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory [10] and show that the amplitude is the same as the one predicted by the exact prepotential. In this letter, we shall perform the one-instanton calculation for the $N=2$ supersymmetric $SU(N_c)$ Yang-Mills theory, and determine the one-instanton correction to the prepotential. Our result agrees with the known exact result for $N_c=3$ case [3] and satisfies the various limits required from the exact solution.

One of the difficulties in the direct instanton calculation in the Higgs and Coulomb phase is the group integration over the instanton configurations. This integration is done over the embedding of the $SU(2)$ to $SU(N_c)$, where the instanton resides. The stability group of this embedding is $U(1)\times SU(N_c-2)$[12], while the integrand has the additional $SU(2)$ symmetry. Hence the group integration to be performed is over the Grassmannian manifold $U(N_c)/(U(2)\times U(N_c-2))$.

This group integration has been studied [13,14] in the case of the $N=1$ supersymmetric $SU(N_c)$ QCD with (N_c-1) fundamental matters in the Higgs phase[6,8,13,14]. In this case, one can choose special vacuum expectation values of the matter scalar fields with global $SU(N_c-1)$ symmetry, which make the group integration easily. For the $N=2$ $SU(N_c)$ Yang-Mills theory in the Coulomb phase, however, it is impossible to make such a simplification, since the vacuum expectation values of the adjoint scalar fields break all the non-abelian gauge symmetries and cannot have such a global symmetry.

One of the new points in the present work is to apply the holomorphy argument [15,7,16] to the group integration. From the holomorphy, the result of the group integration should be independent of the expectation values of the conjugate scalar fields. This fact allows us to tune these vacuum expectation values as simple as possible, while the vacuum expectation values of the scalar fields are kept as arbitrary. Thus we can calculate the four point function of the classically massless fermions directly.

The $N=2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory contains an $N=1$ chiral multiplet $\phi=(A,\psi)$ with the adjoint representation as well as an $N=1$ vector multiplet $W_\alpha=(v_\mu,\lambda)$. The Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}=2\int d^4\theta \mathrm{Tr}(\phi^\dagger e^{-2gV}\phi e^{2gV})+\frac{1}{2g^2}\left(\int d^2\theta \mathrm{Tr} W^\alpha W_\alpha+\text{h.c.}\right), \tag{1}$$

where g is the gauge coupling constant. We will examine this Lagrangian in terms of component fields in the Wess-Zumino gauge.

The potential term $(g^2/4)\mathrm{Tr}([A,A^\dagger]^2)$ has the classical flat directions

$$\begin{aligned}\langle A\rangle &= \Omega A_0\Omega^\dagger,\\ {A_0}_i^{\ j} &= a_i\delta_i^j \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_c} a_i=0\right),\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where Ω is an element of $SU(N_c)$. For generic a_i's, the non-abelian symmetry is completely broken to $U(1)^{N_c-1}$ and the system is in the Coulomb phase.

Let us first consider the case that the scalar vacuum expectation values vanish. Then the classical euclidean equation of motion of the gauge field has instanton solutions. In the singular gauge, the instanton solution with unit topological charge located at the origin is given by $v_\mu=\frac{2}{g}\frac{\rho^2\bar{\eta}_{a\mu\nu}x_\nu}{x^2(x^2+\rho^2)}GJ^aG^\dagger$ [17], where $\bar{\eta}_{a\mu\nu}$ is 't Hooft η-symbol [18] and ρ is the instanton size. $G\in SU(N_c)$, and the J^a are the generators of the $SU(2)$ subgroup obtained by the upper-left-hand corner embedding of the two-dimensional representation of $SU(2)$ into the N_c-dimensional representation of $SU(N_c)$ [19]. Substituting the instanton solution into the gauge kinetic term of the action (1), the action takes the value $S_g=\frac{8\pi^2}{g^2}$.

The bosonic zero-modes depend on the instanton configurations, the size ρ, the location x_0 and the freedom of the embedding G. From the gauge invariance, this embedding is determined by the $SU(N_c)$ rotation of the scalar vacuum expectation values Ω in (2). Hence, fixing $G=1$, the integration measure for the bosonic degrees of freedom is given by [12,13]

$$\frac{2^{4N_c+2}\pi^{4N_c-2}\mu^{4N_c}}{(N_c-2)!(N_c-1)!g^{4N_c}}\int d\rho\rho^{4N_c-5}\int d\Omega\int d^4x_0, \tag{3}$$

where the group integration is normalized as $\int d\Omega=1$. Here we have introduced the regulator mass μ.

Let us consider the fermionic part. Using supersymmetry and superconformal symmetry, the gauginos have the following zero-modes:

$$\begin{aligned}
{\lambda^{SS}}_{\alpha a}{}^{b} &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}\rho^2}{\pi}\frac{x_\mu x_\nu \eta_{c\nu\lambda}\bar{\eta}_{d\mu\lambda}(\tau^c \xi_{SS})_\alpha}{x^2(x^2+\rho^2)^2}{(J^d)_a}^{b}, \\
{\lambda^{SC}}_{\alpha a}{}^{b} &= \frac{\rho}{\pi}\frac{x_\nu \bar{\eta}_{c\nu\lambda}(\tau^+_\lambda \xi_{SC})_\alpha}{(x^2+\rho^2)^2}{(J^c)_a}^{b}, \\
{\lambda_{\alpha a}}^{b} &= \frac{\rho i}{\sqrt{2}\pi}\frac{x_\mu(\tau^-_\mu)_{ac}\varepsilon_{c\alpha}\xi^b}{(x^2+\rho^2)^{3/2}\sqrt{x^2}}, \\
{\bar{\lambda}_{\alpha a}}{}^{b} &= \frac{\rho i}{\sqrt{2}\pi}\frac{x_\mu(\tau^+_\mu)_{\alpha b}\bar{\xi}_a}{(x^2+\rho^2)^{3/2}\sqrt{x^2}},
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where we have introduced the Grassmann odd numbers ${\xi_{SS}}^\alpha$, ${\xi_{SC}}^\alpha$, ξ^a and $\bar{\xi}_a$ ($\alpha = 1, 2,\ a = 3, \cdots, N_c$) to label the gaugino zero-modes. ε_{ab} denotes the 2 by 2 anti-symmetric tensor with $\varepsilon_{12} = 1$, and the τ^+_μ and τ^-_μ denote $(\sigma, -i)$ and (σ, i), respectively. The matter zero-modes are given by the similar expressions as (4), and we use ζ instead of ξ to label them. The measure for the fermionic zero-modes is given by $\int d^{2N_c}\xi d^{2N_c}\zeta \mu^{-2N_c}$ [18].

Now we turn on the vacuum expectation values of the scalar fields. The instanton solution is not an exact solution anymore. But if the instanton size ρ is much smaller than the vacuum expectation values, the field equations are well approximated by* $D_\mu G_{\mu\nu} = 0$ and $D^2 A = 0$. Thus the instanton solution remains as the solutions in this approximation. In order to discuss the solutions for scalar fields, it is convenient to divide the row and column of the the scalar field into the following blocks;

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A^{(1)} & A^{(2)} \\ A^{(3)} & A^{(4)} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5}$$

where $A^{(1)}$, $A^{(2)}$, $A^{(3)}$ and $A^{(4)}$ are 2×2, $2 \times (N_c - 2)$,$(N_c - 2) \times 2$ and $(N_c - 2) \times (N_c - 2)$ matrices,

---

$\star$ See [6] and [20] for more detailed discussions respectively. Then, the solutions for the scalar fields are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A^{(1)}(x) &= \frac{x^2}{x^2+\rho^2}\langle A\rangle^{(1)}_{tl} + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(\langle A\rangle^{(1)})I_2, \\ A^{(2,3)}(x) &= \sqrt{\frac{x^2}{x^2+\rho^2}}\langle A\rangle^{(2,3)}, \\ A^{(4)}(x) &= \langle A\rangle^{(4)}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where I_2 is the 2×2 identity matrix, and $\langle\cdot\rangle_{tl}$ denotes the traceless part.

The classical matter action under the non-vanishing scalar expectation values is given by substituting the kinetic term of the matter in (1) with the approximate classical solutions (6) and the instanton solution. We thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_m &= 8\pi^2\rho^2 f, \\ f &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(1)}_{tl}\langle A\rangle^{(1)}_{tl} + \frac{1}{2}\langle A\rangle^{(3)}\langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(2)} + \frac{1}{2}\langle A\rangle^{(2)}\langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(3)}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

When the scalars have non-vanishing expectation values, the zero-modes other than the supersymmetric ones form Dirac mass terms $2(\bar{\zeta}_{SC}, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})M(\bar{\xi}_{SC}, \xi, \bar{\xi})^t$ through the Yukawa-coupling $\int d^4x 2\sqrt{2}gi$ $\mathrm{Tr}(\psi[A^\dagger, \lambda])$. By substituting the fermionic zero-modes (4) and the solutions of the scalar fields (6) into the Yukawa-coupling, we obtain the following mass matrix M:

$$M = \frac{gi}{2}\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\varepsilon\langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(1)}_{tl} & (\langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(3)})^t & \varepsilon\langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(2)} \\ \langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(3)} & 0 & -\frac{\mathrm{Tr}\langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(1)}}{\sqrt{2}}I_{N_c-2} + \sqrt{2}\langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(4)} \\ (\varepsilon\langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(2)})^t & -\frac{\mathrm{Tr}\langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(1)}}{\sqrt{2}}I_{N_c-2} + \sqrt{2}(\langle A^\dagger\rangle^{(4)})^t & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

where I_{N_c-2} denotes the $(N_c-2) \times (N_c-2)$ identity matrix.

The integration over the non-supersymmetric zero-modes gives the contribution of the determinant of the mass matrix: $\det(2M)$. Since there remain the two supersymmetric zero-modes of each matter fermion and gaugino field, we must insert two matter fermion and two gaugino fields into a correlation function. The appropriate choice of the fields is given by the classically massless fermions $\psi^\dagger_0(x) = \mathrm{Tr}(\langle A\rangle\psi^\dagger(x))$, and similarly for $\lambda^\dagger_0(x)$. Since the Yukawa couplings with the non-vanishing scalar expectation values mix λ and ψ, the surviving supersymmetric zero modes λ^{SS} and ψ^{SS} smear to $\psi^\dagger$ and $\lambda^\dagger$, respectively. To the first order in ρA, the smearing to $\psi^\dagger$ is estimated by the classical field equation of $\psi^\dagger$: $\sigma^\mu D^*_\mu \psi^\dagger - \sqrt{2} g [A^\dagger, \lambda^{SS}] = 0$. A similar equation can be derived for $\lambda_0^\dagger(x)$, and we obtain, for $x - x_0 \gg \rho$,

$$\psi_0^\dagger(x_1)\psi_0^\dagger(x_2)\lambda_0^\dagger(x_3)\lambda_0^\dagger(x_4) \sim (\pi g \rho^2 f)^4 \left(\frac{1}{2}\xi_{SS}^2\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{SS}^2\right) S_F^4, \tag{9}$$

where we have introduced the notation $S_F^4 = S_F^{\alpha\beta}(x_1 - x_0) S_{F\alpha\beta}(x_2 - x_0) S_F^{\alpha'\beta'}(x_3 - x_0) S_{F\alpha'\beta'}(x_4 - x_0)$ with S_F and x_0 denoting the fermion propagator and the location of the instanton, respectively. The insertion of (9) will eliminate the remaining supersymmetric zero-modes in the fermionic integration measure.

After the integration over the fermionic zero-modes and the size of the instanton ρ, we obtain the four point function

$$\langle \psi_0^\dagger(x_1)\psi_0^\dagger(x_2)\lambda_0^\dagger(x_3)\lambda_0^\dagger(x_4)\rangle = \frac{\Lambda_{N_c}^{2N_c}\Gamma(2N_c+2)}{2^7\pi^2 g^{2N_c-2}(N_c-2)!(N_c-1)!}\int d\Omega \frac{\det M}{(gf)^{2N_c-2}}\int d^4x_0 S_F^4, \tag{10}$$

where we have introduced the dynamical scale $\Lambda_{N_c}^{2N_c} = \mu^{2N_c}\exp(-8\pi^2/g^2)$.

Now we discuss the integration over the group manifold $\int d\Omega$. The integration domain can be enlarged from $SU(N_c)$ to $U(N_c)$ trivially. Also one can easily see, from the explicit definition of M and f , that the integrand has the symmetries of $U(2) \times U(N_c - 2)$, where the $U(2)$ is the unitary adjoint rotation of the upper-left-hand corner, and the $U(N_c - 2)$ is that of the bottom-right-hand corner. Hence the integration to be done is over the Grassmannian manifold $U(N_c)/(U(2) \times U(N_c - 2))$. This integration looks very complicated. We will show that the holomorphy argument [15,7,16] simplifies the integration.

We will begin with the simplest case $N_c = 3$. The parameterization of the Grassmannian manifold and the measure are given by [13]

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega &= \begin{pmatrix} (1-yy^\dagger)^{1/2} & -y \\ y^\dagger & (1-y^\dagger y)^{1/2} \end{pmatrix}, \\
y &= \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\int d\Omega &= 2 \int_{0<r_1,r_2}^{r_1+r_2<1} dr_1 dr_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where we have used the fact that the integrand depends on the y_1 and y_2 only through $r_1 =\mid y_1 \mid^2$, $r_2 =\mid y_2 \mid^2$, because there remain $U(1)^2$ symmetry for the flat direction (2).

Parameterizing the scalar vacuum expectation values as $a_1 = v - w$, $a_2 = -v - w$ and $a_3 = 2w$, we get an explicit form for the integrand $\det M/(gf)^4$. From the holomorphy argument, the result of the integration must be independent of the conjugate fields v^* and w^*. Physically, we must regard v^* and w^* as the complex conjugates of v and w, but mathematically, by the analytic continuation, we can regard v^* and w^* as the variables independent of v and w. Thus we have the freedom to set the values of v^* and w^* to make the integrands as simple as possible.

One of choices is to set $w^* = 0$. In this case $\det M$ and f become

$$\begin{aligned}
\det M =& -\frac{g^4 v^{*4}}{64}(16r_1^2 - 8r_1^3 + r_1^4 - 16r_1r_2 + 8r_1^2r_2 - 4r_1^3r_2 + 16r_2^2 + 8r_1r_2^2 \\
&+ 6r_1^2r_2^2 - 8r_2^3 - 4r_1r_2^3 + r_2^4), \\
f =& 2v^*(4v - 2vr_1 - (v+3w)r_1^2 - 2vr_2 + 2vr_1r_2 - (v-3w)r_2^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The indefinite integration over r_1 and r_2 can be performed explicitly with the elementary functions. Thus we obtain

$$\int d\Omega \frac{\det M}{(gf)^4} = -\frac{v^2 + 3w^2}{16v^2(9w^2 - v^2)^2}. \tag{13}$$

Another choice is to set $v^* = 0$. In this case, the vacuum expectation values of the conjugate scalar field has an enhanced symmetry of $SU(2)$, and the integrand becomes simpler. By setting naively $v^* = 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{\det M}{(gf)^4} = -\frac{1}{4(6w+(v-3w)r_1-(v+3w)r_2)^4}. \tag{14}$$

Since the denominator of (14) consists of a linear function of r_1 and r_2, the integration seems to be easily done. But one finds that this naive integration does not give the correct answer, since the procedures of setting $v^* = 0$ and the integration do not commute at the origin $r_1 = r_2 = 0$. By blowing up near the origin, one finds that there is a delta functional contribution from the origin:

$$2 \int_{0<r_1,r_2}^{r_1+r_2<+0} dr_1 dr_2 \frac{\det M}{(gf)^4} = -\frac{1}{2^4 3^3 v^2 w^2}. \tag{15}$$

Adding the integration of (14) to (15), we again obtain the result (13).

Since the denominator of the result (13) is proportional to the discriminant $\triangle_3 = \prod_{i<j}(a_i - a_j)^2$, the result diverges when two of the a_i have the same value. This condition of the divergence is characterized by $f = 0$. In fact, if we assume $f = 0$ and take $\langle A^\dagger \rangle = \langle A \rangle^\dagger$, we obtain two of the a_i's must take the same value.

Now we evaluate the order and the numerical factor of the divergence for the general case of $SU(N_c)$. Let us introduce an infinitesimal parameter ϵ, and parameterize the vacuum expectation values of the scalar field as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A \rangle &= \Omega A_0 \Omega^\dagger, \\ A_0 &= \begin{pmatrix} {A_0}^{(1)} & 0 \\ 0 & {A_0}^{(4)} \end{pmatrix}, \\ {A_0}^{(1)} &= \begin{pmatrix} a+\epsilon & 0 \\ 0 & a-\epsilon \end{pmatrix}, \\ \langle A^\dagger \rangle &= \Omega \bar{A}_0 \Omega^\dagger. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where ${A_0}^{(4)}$ and $\bar{A}_0$ are diagonal matrices. But here the conjugate scalar expectation values $\bar{A}_0$ are taken to be independent of the A_0, and we assume the diagonal elements of $\bar{A}_0$ take different values from each other. One notices that the vacuum expectation values (16) are the flat directions.

Since $f = \epsilon(\bar{a}_1 - \bar{a}_2)$ for $\Omega = 1$, the important contribution of the integration will come from the Ω which gives $f \sim O(\epsilon)$. Hence we blow up Ω as

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} U_1 & \sqrt{\epsilon} U_2 \\ \sqrt{\epsilon} U_3 & U_4 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{17}$$

Substituting (17) into (16) and using the unitarity of the Ω, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f =& \epsilon\Big(\bar{a}_1 - \bar{a}_2 + \mathrm{Tr}\left(A_0{}^{(4)} \bar{A}_0{}^{(4)} W^\dagger W\right) - a \mathrm{Tr}\left(W^\dagger W \bar{A}_0{}^{(4)}\right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\bar{A}_0{}^{(1)}\right) \mathrm{Tr}\left(A_0{}^{(4)} W^\dagger W\right) + \frac{a}{2} \mathrm{Tr}\left(W^\dagger W\right) \mathrm{Tr}\left(\bar{A}_0{}^{(1)}\right)\Big) + O(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $W = U_1^\dagger U_2$.

Since $\det M$ depends only on $\langle A^\dagger \rangle$, the lowest order of $\det M$ is $O(\epsilon^0)$. The 0-th order of Ω in ϵ is an element of the invariant group $U(2) \times U(N_c - 2)$. Hence it is enough to evaluate $\det M$ under $\Omega = 1$, and we obtain

$$\det M = -\frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{g^2}{2}\right)^{N_c - 1} (\bar{a}_1 - \bar{a}_2)^2 \prod_{i=3}^{N_c} \left(\bar{a}_i - \frac{\bar{a}_1 + \bar{a}_2}{2}\right)^2. \tag{19}$$

The integral measure is explicitly defined by

$$\begin{aligned} d\Omega &= \frac{1}{V_{N_c}} \prod_{i=1,j=1}^{N_c} d^2\Omega_{ij} \delta(\Omega\Omega^\dagger - 1), \\ \delta(\Omega\Omega^\dagger - 1) &= \prod_{i=1}^{N_c} \delta((\Omega\Omega^\dagger)_{ii} - 1) \prod_{j<k}^{N_c} \delta^2((\Omega\Omega^\dagger)_{jk}), \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where V_{N_c} is a normalization constant. Using the result in the literature [12], this volume factor is obtained as $V_{N_c} = \pi^{\frac{N_c(N_c+1)}{2}} \prod_{k=2}^{N_c} \frac{1}{(k-1)!}$. Substituting (17) into (20), we obtain, in the lowest order of ϵ,

$$\int d\Omega \frac{\det M}{(gf)^{2N_c - 2}} = \epsilon^{2(N_c - 2)} \frac{V_2 V_{N_c - 2}}{V_{N_c}} \int dW \frac{\det M}{(gf)^{2N_c - 2}}, \tag{21}$$

where we have integrated over the invariant group $U_1 \times U_4 \in U(2) \times U(N_c - 2)$, and have changed the integration variable U_2 by the transformation $W = U_1^\dagger U_2$.

To evaluate the integration, let us parameterize

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} y_3 & \cdots & y_{N_c} \\ z_3 & \cdots & z_{N_c} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{22}$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \epsilon \left(\bar{a}_1 - \bar{a}_2 + \sum_{i=3}^{N_c} \left(\bar{a}_i - \frac{\bar{a}_1 + \bar{a}_2}{2} \right) (a_i - a)(\mid y_i \mid^2 + \mid z_i \mid^2) \right), \\ dW &= \prod_{i=3}^{N_c} \pi^2 d \mid y_i \mid^2 d \mid z_i \mid^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Thus we finally obtain

$$\int d\Omega \frac{\det M}{(gf)^{2N_c-2}} \sim -\frac{(N_c-1)!(N_c-2)!}{2^{N_c+1}(2N_c-3)!} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 \prod_{i=3}^{N_c}(a_i - a)^2}. \tag{24}$$

for $a_1 = a + \epsilon$ and $a_2 = a - \epsilon$. Here the dependences on $\bar{a}_i$ have certainly disappeared.

From the gauge invariance, the full expression must be a symmetric function of a_i. If we also assume the full expression is a rational function of a_i, we obtain, by a dimensional consideration, a unique result

$$\int d\Omega \frac{\det M}{(gf)^{2N_c-2}} = -\frac{(N_c-1)!(N_c-2)!}{2^{N_c}(2N_c-3)!} \frac{\triangle'_{N_c}(a)}{\triangle_{N_c}(a)}, \tag{25}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \triangle_{N_c}(a) &= \prod_{k<l}^{N_c} (a_k - a_l)^2, \\ \triangle'_{N_c}(a) &= \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} \prod_{k<l,k\neq i,l\neq i}^{N_c} (a_k - a_l)^2, \\ &\left(\triangle'_{N_c}(a) = 2 \quad \text{for } N_c = 2 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Note that the present formula (25) for $N_c = 3$ agrees with (13).

Substituting (25) into (10), we finally obtain the four point function

$$\langle\psi_0^\dagger(x_1)\psi_0^\dagger(x_2)\lambda_0^\dagger(x_3)\lambda_0^\dagger(x_4)\rangle = -\frac{\Lambda_{N_c}^{2N_c}\Gamma(2N_c+2)}{2^{N_c+7}\pi^2 g^{2N_c-2}\Gamma(2N_c-2)}\frac{\triangle'_{N_c}(a)}{\triangle_{N_c}(a)}\int d^4x_0 S_F^4 \tag{27}$$

Now we will derive the 1-instanton correction of the prepotential from the result (27). In the $N=1$ language, the $N=2$ $SU(N_c)$ SYM theory has the following low energy effective Lagrangian density:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= \frac{1}{4\pi}\mathrm{Im}\left[\int d^4\theta\left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{F}(\phi)}{\partial\phi_i}\bar{\phi}_i\right)+\int d^2\theta\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial^2\mathcal{F}(\phi)}{\partial\phi_i\partial\phi_j}W^\alpha_i W_{\alpha j}\right)\right]\\ &= \frac{2}{g^2}\int d^4\theta\left(\mathrm{Tr}\phi_i\bar{\phi}_i\right)+\frac{1}{8\pi}\mathrm{Im}\int d^2\theta\left(\frac{\partial^2\mathcal{F}_1}{\partial\phi_i\partial\phi_j}W^\alpha_i W_{\alpha j}\right)+\cdots,\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_1$ denotes the 1-instanton correction to the prepotential.

The 1-instanton correction to the four point function is given by

$$\langle\psi_0^\dagger(x_1)\psi_0^\dagger(x_2)\lambda_0^\dagger(x_3)\lambda_0^\dagger(x_4)\rangle = \frac{g^8}{2^7\pi i}\langle a_j\rangle\langle a_k\rangle\langle a_l\rangle\langle a_m\rangle\frac{\partial^4\mathcal{F}_1}{\partial a_j\partial a_k\partial a_l\partial a_m}\int d^4x_0 S_F^4. \tag{29}$$

Comparing with the 1-instatanton calculation (27) and taking into account the rescaling of the fields by $g^\star$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = -\frac{i\Lambda_{N_c}^{2N_c}}{2^{N_c}\pi}\frac{\triangle'_{N_c}(a)}{\triangle_{N_c}(a)}. \tag{30}$$

One can check this result (30) by using consistency under the matching condition of the gauge coupling. Parameterize the scalar vacuum expectation values as

$$\begin{aligned}a_i &= a'_i - b \quad (i=1,\cdots,N_c-1),\\ a_{N_c} &= (N_c-1)b,\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

and consider b is very large compared to a'_i. Then, below the scale b, the gauge group of the system is

---

$\star$ The normalizations of the kinetic terms are different by g between (1) and (28) effectively $SU(N_c-1)$ with the dynamical scale given by the following matching condition [11]:

$$m^2 \Lambda_{N_c-1}^{2(N_c-1)} = \Lambda_{N_c}^{2N_c}. \tag{32}$$

Here the matching scale m is the mass of the gauge bosons of the gauge symmetry broken by the b, and its value is $m^2 = 2(N_c b)^2$. On the other hand, substituting (31) into (30), we obtain, in the large b limit,

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = -\frac{i\Lambda_{N_c}^{2N_c}}{2^{N_c}\pi (N_c b)^2} \frac{\triangle'_{N_c-1}(a')}{\triangle_{N_c-1}(a')} + o(b^{-2}). \tag{33}$$

Using the matching condition (32), this is nothing but the 1-instanton correction (30) with the gauge group $SU(N_c-1)$.

A further check comes from the exact solutions discussed recently. The discussions are based on the hyperelliptic curve [2,4]

$$y^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{N_c} (x-e_i)^2 - (\Lambda_{N_c}^{\mathrm{ex}})^{2N_c}, \tag{34}$$

where $a_i \sim e_i$ classically. Taking the b very large and rescaling the x and y appropriately, one obtains the following matching condition[4]:

$$(\Lambda_{N_c}^{\mathrm{ex}})^{2N_c} = (N_c b)^2 (\Lambda_{N_c}^{\mathrm{ex}})^{2(N_c-1)} \tag{35}$$

Comparing with the physical matching condition (32), the both scales should have the following relation:

$$\Lambda_{N_c}^{\mathrm{ex}} = 2^{\frac{d-N_c}{2N_c}} \Lambda_{N_c}, \tag{36}$$

where d is a parameter to be fixed. Substituting (36) into (30) and (28), we obtain

$$\mathcal{F} = i\left(\frac{4\pi}{g_0^2} - \frac{N_c}{2\pi}\ln(\Lambda_{N_c}^{\mathrm{ex}})^2 + \cdots\right)\mathrm{Tr}(\phi^2) - \frac{i(\Lambda_{N_c}^{\mathrm{ex}})^{2N_c}}{2^d\pi}\frac{\triangle'_{N_c}(a)}{\triangle_{N_c}(a)} + \cdots, \tag{37}$$

where we have explicitly written down the dynamical scale dependence of the one-loop correction to compare the prepotential (37) with the exact solutions unambiguously*

$*$ Actually, the normalization of the prepotential depends on literatures.

The explicit expressions of the one-instanton corrections of the exact prepotentials for the $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ cases are known [1,3]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}^{\rm ex}_{SU(2)} &= i\left(-\frac{1}{4\pi}\ln(\Lambda_2^{\rm ex})^2+\cdots\right){\rm Tr}(\phi^2)-\frac{i(\Lambda_2^{\rm ex})^4}{2^4\pi}\frac{\triangle_2'(a)}{\triangle_2(a)}+\cdots,\\
\mathcal{F}^{\rm ex}_{SU(3)} &= i\left(-\frac{3}{4\pi}\ln(\Lambda_3^{\rm ex})^2+\cdots\right){\rm Tr}(\phi^2)-\frac{i(\Lambda_3^{\rm ex})^6}{2^3\pi}\frac{\triangle_3'(a)}{\triangle_3(a)}+\cdots.
\end{aligned}
\qquad (38)
$$

Normalizing with the one-loop coefficients, our result (37) with $d = 2$ agrees with the exact solutions (38) for the both cases. Further this $d = 2$ agrees with the discussions by Finnell and Pouliot [11], who derived the similar relation between the scales for the $N_c = 2$ case by discussing the physical matching condition of the gauge couplings between the original and the effective theories.

We have explicitly performed the 1-instanton calculation and derived the 1-instanton correction to the prepotential from the microscopic point of view. Although there appeared a difficulty in the integration over the Grassmannian manifold $U(N_c)/(U(2)\times U(N_c-2))$, we have done this integration by using the holomorphy argument effectively. The present method would be applicable to other gauge groups and the $N = 2$ massive QCD. Concerning the higher instanton contributions, it seems a quite interesting problem to calculate them from the microscopic approach and compare them with the exact solutions. We note that the holomorphy argument holds for general $N = 1$ supersymmetric theories. Therefore our method will be effective for other $N = 1$ models.

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank S.-K. Yang for stimulating discussions and encouragement, and N.S. would also like to thank the elementary particle group of Tohoku University and especially S. Watamura for their hospitality. The work of K.I. is supported in part by University of Tsukuba Research Projects and the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Education (No. 07210210). The work of N.S. is supported by the JSPS fellowship and the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Education (No. 06-3758).

REFERENCES

1. N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B426** (1994), 19; N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B431** (1994), 484.
2. A. Klemm, W. Lerche, S. Yankielowicz and S. Theisen, *Phys. Lett.* **B344** (1995), 169.
3. A. Klemm, W. Lerche and S. Theisen, CERN preprint CERN-TH/95-104.
4. P.C. Argyres and A.E. Faraggi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74** (1995), 3931.
5. U.H. Danielsson and B. Sundborg, *Phys. Lett.* **B358** (1995), 273, Uppsala preprint USITP-95-12;
   M. Douglas and S. Shenker, *Nucl. Phys.* **B447** (1995), 271;
   A. Brandhuber and K. Landsteiner, *Phys. Lett.* **B358** (1995), 73;
   A. Hanany and Y. Oz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B452** (1995), 283;
   P. Argyres, M. Plesser and A. Shapere, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995), 1699;
   J.A. Minahan and D.Nemeschansky, preprint USC-95-019;
   M. Matone, *Phys. Lett.* **B357** (1995), 342;
   K. Ito and S.-K. Yang, *Phys. Lett.* **B366** (1996), 165;
   P.C. Argyres and A.D. Shapere, Rutgers preprint RU-95-61;
   A. Hanany, preprint IASSNS-HEP-95-76.
6. I. Affleck, M. Dine and N. Seiberg, *Nucl. Phys.* **B241** (1994), 493.
7. D. Amati, K. Konishi, Y. Meurice, G.C. Rossi and G. Veneziano, *Phys. Rep.* **162** (1988), 169.
8. V.A. Novikkov, M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B260** (1985), 157.
9. M.T. Grisaru, W. Siegel and M. Rocek, *Nucl. Phys.* **B159** (1979), 429.
10. N. Seiberg, *Phys. Lett.* **B206** (1988), 75.
11. D. Finnell and P. Pouliot, *Nucl. Phys.* **B453** (1995), 225.
12. C.W. Bernard, *Phys. Rev.* **D19** (1979), 3013.
13. S.F. Cordes, *Nucl. Phys.* **B273** (1986), 629.
14. J. Fuchs, *Nucl. Phys.* **B282** (1987), 437.
15. N. Seiberg, *Phys. Lett.* **B318** (1993), 469.
16. M.A. Shifman and A.I. Vainshtein, *Nucl. Phys.* **B359** (1991), 571.

17. A. Vainshtein, V. Zakharov, V. Novikov and M. Shifman, *Sov. Phys. Usp.* **25** (1982), 195.

18. G. 't Hooft, *Phys. Rev.* **D14** (1976), 3432.

19. C.W. Bernard, N.H. Christ, A.H. Guth and E.J. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D16** (1977), 2967.

20. I. Affleck, *Nucl. Phys.* **B191** (1981), 429.